

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 remain in the application. Claim 8 is canceled. Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 are amended. The specification has also been amended.

***Telephone Interview***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the clarification on the objection to the drawings and the rejection of Claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner's comments provided during this telephone interview are reflected below.

***Drawings***

The drawings remain objected to because the Examiner alleges that the "method of displacing sheets for printing off center text as described in claims 6-8" is not shown. In the last Response Applicant pointed out to the Examiner that the displacement of the text is shown in Figs. 8-11. The Examiner responds by stating that "although the displacement of the actual text" is shown, "the methods of displacing the sheets" are not shown.

During the telephone interview with the Examiner, the Examiner agreed to withdraw this objection if Applicant amends the drawings to include the base. Applicant therefore amends Figures 8, 9 and 11 to include a base labeled as reference numeral 30, as shown in the attached sheets, and also amends page 6 of the specification to correspond with these amendments to the figures. Approval of these drawing changes is respectfully requested.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-8 have been objected to because of informalities. In response, Applicant amends the claims to overcome these informalities. And with regard to Claim 1, the Examiner states that in line 11 "therefor" should be replaced with "therefore." Applicant disagrees. The American Heritage Dictionary defines "therefore" as "[f]or that reason; hence," and defines "therefor" as "[f]or that, this or it." "Therefore" is usually followed by a conclusion, whereas "therefor" usually occurs at the end of a phrase. Claim 1 recites in part "varying at least one of the outer edges of the bodies

of text in accordance with dimensions provided *therefor*" (emphasis added). In this case the word at issue occurs at the end of a phrase and is not followed by a conclusion; the spelling of the word as "therefor" is therefore correct. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this object is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph***

Claims 6-8 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as claiming subject matter allegedly not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that it is not clear "what form the base for carrying paper takes, for example, whether it is feeding the sheets to the printing apparatus or supporting the sheets during the printing process."

Applicant asserted in the last Response that the specification makes clear that the base is at least supporting the sheets during the printing process. This is clear from the specification, for example, on page 3, second and third to last line, where it states that "the base [is] carrying the sheets with respect to the printing means of the machine."

In the Office Action the Examiner maintains her position. However, during the telephone interview, the Examiner stated that she would withdraw this rejection if Applicant were to amend Claims 6-8 to clarify their meaning. The Examiner had some particular concerns, which Applicant has addressed by the amendments to the claims.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph***

Claim 2 remains rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner maintains her position that the term "standard size" is unclear.

Applicant asserted in the last response that it is clear from the specification on page 3, first full paragraph, that "standard size" means those standard sizes (e.g., A2, A3, A4, A5) as defined by DIN (which is the acronym for Deutsche Industrie Norm, and upon which the ISO

standards are based). Standard size therefore does not mean different things to different people, as the Examiner alleges, and thus the term “standard size” in claim 2 is not indefinite.

The Examiner responds by asserting that standard size sheets in the U.S. do not conform with standard sizes defined by DIN. Although Applicant does not agree with the Examiner’s position, in order moot this issue and advance prosecution, Applicant amends Claim 2 to recite “standard DIN size.”

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-5 remain rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feister (U.S. Patent No. 452,933) in view of Yasuo (EP 0 895 183) and Garber (U.S. Patent No. 3,593,987). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

As asserted in the last Response, none of the references suggests printing bodies of text with a symmetrical distribution with respect to a centre of symmetry of a sheet being printed and likewise symmetrically with respect to one or two axes of symmetry, which pass through the centre of symmetry and which are parallel with outer edges of the sheet, as required by the claims.

The Examiner responds by alleging that Feister, on page 1, lines 33-34, teaches folding sheets at their center margin. The Examiner then goes on to assert that “[t]his can reasonably be interpreted to imply that the text on the sheets is printed with a symmetrical distribution with respect to this center fold as a center of symmetry of the sheet being printed.”

Applicant strongly disagrees with the Examiner’s position. Referring to Fig. 1 of the application, the centre of symmetry is a single point on the sheet and is identified with reference numeral 2; the axes of symmetry, which pass through the centre of symmetry 2 and which are parallel with outer edges of the sheet, are identified with reference numerals 3 and 4, respectively. The center fold in Feister to which the Examiner refers is not a single point and is more similar to the axis of symmetry 3 of the application. While Feister may teach printing text with respect to an axis of symmetry such as that referred to with reference numeral 3 in the application, Feister does not teach or suggest printing text with respect to a centre of symmetry 2.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. According, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: July 23, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Laura C. Brutman  
Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 5257  
New York, New York 10150-5257  
(212) 527-7700  
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant